STD

U.S. District Court DISTRICT OF ARIZONA (Phoenix Division) CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:11-cv-00396-ROS Internal Use Only

AutoEnginuity LLC v. Morris

Assigned to: Chief Judge Roslyn O Silver

Cause: 15:1125 Trademark Infringement (Lanham Act)

Date Filed: 03/02/2011 Jury Demand: None

Nature of Suit: 840 Trademark Jurisdiction: Federal Question

Plaintiff

AutoEnginuity LLC

an Arizona limited liability company

represented by Jeffrey William Johnson

Schmeiser Olsen & Watts LLP

18 E University Dr

Ste 101

Mesa, AZ 85201

480-655-0073

Fax: 480-655-9536

Email: jeffrey.johnson@azbar.org

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Sean Kealii Enos

Schmeiser Olsen & Watts LLP

18 E University Dr

Ste 101

Mesa, AZ 85201

480-655-0073

Fax: 480-655-9536

Email: kenos@iplawusa.com

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

V.

Defendant

Sean Morris

Trademark 3,644,213

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
03/02/2011	3 1	COMPLAINT. Filing fee received: \$ 350.00, receipt number 0970-4963499, filed by AutoEnginuity LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit, # 2 Civil Cover Sheet)(Submitted by Jeffrey Johnson)(JRD) (Entered: 03/02/2011)
03/02/2011	3 2	Corporate Disclosure Statement by AutoEnginuity LLC. (Submitted by Jeffrey Johnson) (JRD) (Entered: 03/02/2011)
03/02/2011	3 3	Filing fee paid, receipt number 0970-4963499. This case has been assigned to

	AAA 0000 www.	the Honorable Roslyn O Silver. All future pleadings or documents should bear the correct case number: CV-11-396-PHX-ROS. Notice of Availability of Magistrate Judge to Exercise Jurisdiction form attached. (JRD) (Entered: 03/02/2011)
03/02/2011	3 <u>4</u>	SUMMONS Submitted by AutoEnginuity LLC. (Submitted by Jeffrey Johnson) (JRD) (Entered: 03/02/2011)
03/02/2011	3 <u>5</u>	Summons Issued as to Sean Morris. (JRD). *** IMPORTANT: When printing the summons, select "Document and stamps" or "Document and comments" for the seal to appear on the document. (Entered: 03/02/2011)

Case 2:11-cv-00396-ROS Document 1 Filed 03/02/11 Page 1 of 25

	Case 2.11-CV-00000-1000 Document 1	Thou borozi i Tago i or zo					
1 2 3	Sean Kealii Enos (#023634) Jeffrey W. Johnson (#024435) SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS, LLP 18 E. University Drive, Suite 101 Mesa, Arizona 85201						
5 6	Telephone: (480) 655-0073 Facsimile: (480) 655-9536 kenos@IPlawUSA.com jjohnson@IPlawUSA.com						
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff						
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT						
9	DISTRICT OF ARIZONA						
10							
11 12	AUTOENGINUITY, LLC, an Arizona limited liability company,	Case No.					
13	Plaintiff	COMPLAINT SEEKING INJUNCTIVE AND MONETARY RELIEF FOR TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT, FALSE					
15 16	v. Sean Morris, an individual,	DESIGNATION OF ORIGIN AND CYBERSQUATTING					
17 18	Defendant.						
19		1					
20	Plaintiff AUTOENGINUITY, LLC (hereinafter "AutoEnginuity"), for its						
21	complaint against defendant Sean Morris (hereinafter "Defendant"), by and through						
22	undersigned counsel, alleges as follows:						
23 24	OVER	VIEW					
25	1. AutoEnginuity owns the federa	ally registered mark AUTOENGINUITY,					
	has rights, including common law rights, in the trademark, service mark, and trade						

name AUTOENGINUITY (collectively "the AUTOENGINUITY Marks"), and has continuously used the AUTOENGINUITY Marks in connection with its business as a designer, producer, and provider of automotive diagnostic tool hardware and software since February of 2002.

- 2. Defendant sells and markets automotive diagnostic tool hardware and software through various websites.
- 3. In connection with its sale and marketing of automotive diagnostic tool hardware and software, Defendant uses and has used the AUTOENGINUITY Marks in commerce, including as URLs www.autoenginuity.net, www.autoenginuityscantool.com (hereinafter "the Accused Domain Names" or "the Accused Websites") and in the content contained in and on its websites www.autoenginuity.net, autoenginuityscantool.com, 61-autoscan.com, and autoscommunity.cloudaccess.net (collectively "the Defendant's Websites").
- 4. Defendant's use of the AUTOENGINUITY Marks is a bait-and-switch scheme, luring customers interested in purchasing genuine AutoEnginuity products from AutoEnginuity to purchase illegitimate products, including illegal copies of Plaintiff's software, from Defendant.
- 5. Defendant further falsely represents to purchasers of its products that they are purchasing the products from AutoEnginuity, when in fact they are not.
- 6. Defendant's unauthorized use of the AUTOENGINUITY Marks creates obvious confusion for consumers. The unauthorized use of the AUTOENGINUITY Marks diverts AutoEnginuity's clients away from AutoEnginuity and its website to Defendant and Defendant's websites, damages the reputation associated with the AUTOENGINUITY Marks, including by providing pirated software in conjunction

with the products sold by Defendant, confuses customers into believing that in dealing with Defendant, they are in fact dealing with AutoEnginuity, and harms

AutoEnginuity's profitability by forcing it to provide service and support for products using pirated software sold by Defendant.

- 7. Defendant's infringement of the AUTOENGINUITY Marks further unfairly allows Defendant to profit as a result of AutoEnginuity's national and international success with the AUTOENGINUITY Marks and products sold in conjunction with those marks.
- 8. In connection with marketing its goods and services, Defendant also makes false and misleading descriptions and representations of fact regarding the nature and source of the products being sold, both by representing to consumers that it is the Plaintiff, AutoEnginuity, and by representing that pirated software it sells is legitimate software.
- 9. On December 15, 2010, AutoEnginuity sent an email to Defendant demanding that it cease and desist from all unlawful use of Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks and assign www.autoenginuity.net to Plaintiff. Defendant responded to that email, but has not complied with Plaintiff's demands.
- 10. On December 14, 2010, AutoEnginuity sent an email to wildwestdomains.com demanding that it disable access to certain materials on autoenginuity.net that were posted on that site in violation of AutoEnginuity's copyrights.
- 11. Subsequent to the December 14, 2010 email to wildwestdomains.com, wildwestdomains.com disabled access to the certain content on autoenginuity.net.

- 12. Subsequent to the disabling on the infringing content on autoenginuity.net, Defendant caused the website autoenginuity.net to resolve to the web page 61-AUTOSCAN.COM, which is a site on which Defendant encouraged visitors to download pirated copies of AutoEnginuity's software using a torrent download site.
- 13. Sometime in February, 2011, Defendant further caused the URLs autoenginuity.net, autoenginuityscantool.com, and 61-autoscan.com, to resolve to the website autoscommunity.cloudaccess.net, a site on which Defendant features products that compete with Plaintiff's products.
- 14. Plaintiff seeks monetary and injunctive relief pursuant to its claims arising out of Defendant's cybersquatting and willful infringement and fraudulent use of Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks, including Plaintiff's federally registered trademark "AUTOENGINUITY", U.S. Trademark Reg. #3644213 (Attached hereto as Exhibit A, and hereinafter referred to as the "Mark").

PARTIES

- 15. AutoEnginuity is an Arizona Limited Liability Company with its principal place of business located at 3715 E. Palm Street, Mesa, AZ 85215. AutoEnginuity designs and sells automotive diagnostic tool hardware and software. AutoEnginuity is the exclusive owner of trademark rights, the AUTOENGINUITY Marks, on which the claims of relief asserted herein are based.
- 16. Upon information and belief, Defendant Sean Morris is an individual residing at 53 Palamino, Boca Raton, FL, 33487.
- 17. Defendant sells automotive diagnostic tool hardware and software in competition with AutoEnginuity.

18. Defendant does business in Arizona, including by entering into web hosting agreements on more than one occasion with an Arizona business, and including shipping products sold by Defendant from Arizona to Defendant's customers.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 19. This is an action for cybersquatting arising under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(d), trademark infringement arising under 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1), and false designation of origin arising under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a).
- 20. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the claims pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1121 and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338.
- 21. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claim occurred in this District, and Defendants transact business in this District, including registering and using the infringing domain names in this District.
- 22. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant pursuant to the provisions of the Arizona's long arm statute, Rule 4.2(a), *Ariz. R. Civ. P.*, and the laws of the United States. Defendant has purposefully availed itself of the benefits and protections of Arizona law by doing business in Arizona, including registering and using the infringing domain names and hosting its websites in Arizona. Furthermore, Defendant has purposefully directed its conduct toward Plaintiff in Arizona by, among other things, shipping product sold by Defendant under Plaintiff's name and using Plaintiff's Arizona return address. In addition, Defendant's actions as described herein have caused and will continue to cause injury to Plaintiff, a resident of the State, and, if not enjoined, will permit Defendant to wrongfully derive revenue from Defendant's activities within this State.

2.

ALLEGATIONS

Plaintiff's Business and Marks

- 23. Plaintiff AutoEnginuity is a leading designer, manufacturer and seller of automotive diagnostic tools, including both hardware and software.
- 24. AutoEnginuity solicits and receives customer orders for its products internationally through various means, including via the internet at its websites www.autoenginuity.com.
- 25. In or about February 11, 2002, AutoEnginuity created, adopted and commenced use of the AUTOENGINUITY Marks, and has continuously used the AUTOENGINUITY Marks in interstate commerce since that date.
- 26. As a result of the time, effort and money invested in its business,
 AutoEnginuity has achieved a reputation for excellence in the design, manufacture and sale of its automotive diagnostic tools and associated hardware and software.
- 27. As a result of its reputation for excellence, AutoEnginuity enjoys substantial demand for, and sales of, its products and services both to end users and automotive original equipment manufacturers.
- 28. Together with its reputation for excellence, AutoEnginuity enjoys tremendous goodwill in its AUTOENGINUITY Marks.
- 29. The AUTOENGINUITY Marks have been extensively used by AutoEnginuity in United States interstate commerce in connection with advertising and promoting AutoEnginuity's products and services on AutoEnginuity's website on the internet at www.autoenginuity.com and in other publications and advertising.

- 30. The AUTOENGINUITY Marks are prominently presented on AutoEnginuity's website, computer systems, advertisements, product packaging, manuals, and technical and informational literature.
- 31. The AUTOENGINUITY Marks have been extensively and continually advertised and promoted by AutoEnginuity within the United States for the past nine years.
- 32. Substantial amounts of time, effort and money have been expended over the years in ensuring that the purchasing public associates the AUTOENGINUITY Marks exclusively with AutoEnginuity.
- 33. Since at least as early as 2002, AutoEnginuity has operated its website available at www.autoenginuity.com. AutoEnginuity's website is an important resource used constantly by the general public, receiving hundreds of "hits" or visits each day. AutoEnginuity spends tens of thousands of dollars each year operating and maintaining its website. Moreover, AutoEnginuity spends hundreds of thousands of dollars each year promoting and advertising its website, products and services under the AUTOENGINUITY Marks.
- 34. The AUTOENGINUITY Marks are widely known and recognized among consumers and members of the automotive scan tool industry in the United States.
- 35. The AUTOENGINUITY Marks are unique and distinctive and, as such, designate a single source of origin.
- 36. As a result of AutoEnginuity's extensive and exclusive use, the AUTOENGINUITY Marks have developed extensive goodwill in the automotive scan tool market, and are extremely valuable to AutoEnginuity.

- 37. AutoEnginuity expends substantial effort and expense to protect the AUTOENGINUITY Marks and the AUTOENGINUITY Marks' distinctiveness in the marketplace.
- 38. By virtue of the extensive scope of the sales made and the substantial sums spent to advertise and promote products and services under the

AUTOENGINUITY Marks, such marks have acquired strong secondary meaning in the minds of the purchasing public and the business community, and are highly distinctive, and serve uniquely to identify AutoEnginuity products and services.

- 39. Through widespread and favorable public acceptance and recognition, these marks have become assets of incalculable value as symbols of AutoEnginuity products and services.
- 40. Having been promoted to the general public, and having exclusively identified AutoEnginuity and its products and services, the AUTOENGINUITY Marks symbolize the tremendous goodwill associated with AutoEnginuity and are a property right of incalculable value.
 - 41. The AUTOENGINUITY Marks are valid and enforceable trademarks.
- 42. AutoEnginuity is the owner of the following registration on the Principal Trademark Register of the Unites States Patent and Trademark Office: 3,644,213. A copy of the registration certificate is attached as Exhibit A.
- 43. The above-listed registration is valid, subsisting, and in full force and effect.

Defendant's Business

44. Upon information and belief, Defendant is engaged in the business of selling automotive-related hardware and software, including automotive scan tools.

- 45. Defendant uses and has used various websites, including the Defendant's Websites, as a means of promoting products, advertising products and selling products, including automotive scan tool hardware and software, in interstate commerce.
- 46. Defendant uses and has used various websites, including the Defendant's Websites to transact business in interstate commerce, including taking and fulfilling orders for automotive-related hardware and software, including automotive scan tools.
- 47. Upon information and belief, Defendant ships products to multiple states within the United States.
- 48. Upon information and belief, Defendant receives payments for products from customers in multiple states within the United States.
- 49. Defendant has represented to customers that Defendant's business is located in the state of Arizona.
- 50. Defendant has represented to customers that products purchased from Defendant's business were shipped from Arizona.
- 51. Defendant is the registrant for the domain name autoenginuity.net (see attached Exhibit B).
- 52. Upon information and belief, Defendant registered autoenginuity.net at least as early as December, 2010 (see attached Exhibit B).
- 53. Defendant is the registrant for the domain name autoenginuityscantool.com (see attached Exhibit C).
- 54. Defendant registered autoenginuityscantool.com at least as early as March, 2010 (see attached Exhibit C).

55. Defendant is the registrant for the domain 61-AUTOSCAN.COM (see attached Exhibit D).

56. Defendant registered 61-AUTOSCAN.COM at least as early as December, 2010 (see attached Exhibit D).

Defendant's Concealment of Defendant's Identity

- 57. Defendant employs various means to conceal Defendant's true identity and involvement in the use of Defendant's domain names, including by falsifying Defendant's address on products purchased from Defendant and shipped to customers (see attached Exhibit E).
- 58. Defendant has conducted business, or is conducting business, is holding itself out as, or has held itself out as, Plaintiff AutoEnginuity, by, for example, using email addresses on its websites that are confusingly similar to Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks (see attached Exhibit F).

Defendant's Unlawful Activity

- 59. At least two of Defendant's domain names, the Accused Domain Names autoenginuity.net and autoenginuityscantool.com, are confusingly similar to Plaintiff's mark AutoEnginuity.
- 60. For commercial gain, Defendant uses the Accused Domain Names to divert Internet users searching for Plaintiff via Plaintiff's distinctive mark AutoEnginuity, to Defendant's Websites.
- 61. Defendant uses or used the Accused Domain Names as the domain names for the Accused Websites, which are websites that display or have displayed advertising and offer or have offered goods or services that are identical, directly competitive, or

closely related to those sold or provided in connection with Plaintiff's distinctive mark AutoEnginuity.

- 62. Plaintiff has not authorized Defendant to use in any way, or register as part of any Internet domain name, any of the AUTOENGINUITY Marks, the Accused Domain Names, or the Accused Websites.
- 63. Each of the Accused Domain Names is identical or confusingly similar to Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks.
- 64. Defendant uses the Accused Domain Names to attract users to the Accused Websites, on which it falsely holds itself out as, or has held itself out as, Plaintiff AutoEnginuity.
- 65. Defendant uses the Accused Domain Names to attract users to its Accused Websites and Defendant's Websites, on which it does or has encouraged potential customers to purchase software pirated and illegally copied from Plaintiff AutoEnginuity.
- 66. Defendant uses the Accused Domain Names to attract users to its Accused Websites and Defendant's Websites, on which products in direct competition with Plaintiff's products are featured.
- 67. Defendant, on the Accused Websites and through its interactions with its customers, falsely communicates to, or has falsely communicated to, purchasers and potential purchasers, that the software Defendant is offering is genuine, legal software, and that the purchasers are purchasing it from AutoEnginuity.
- 68. Defendant, on the Accused Websites and through its interactions with its customers, falsely communicates to customers, or has falsely communicated to customers, that they are dealing with AutoEnginuity, including by placing

69. For example, in early December of 2010, Dave Cole, a customer located in Indiana seeking to purchase an AutoEnginuity scan tool, visited one of the Accused

AutoEnginuity's Arizona address on the return address labels for products shipped by

Websites hosted at one of the Accused Domain Names.

Defendant, even though Defendant's address is in Florida.

- 70. On December 5, 2010, as a result of his visit to one of the Accused Websites at one of the Accused Domain Names, Dave Cole purchased a scan tool from Defendant, using an eBay account associated with Dawn Knapp, listing Dawn's email as dawn0808@msn.com. See attached Exhibit G showing payment received from Dave Cole, Grabill IN, and listing 61autoscan as the Buyer's ID, with payment sent to sales@autoenginuity.com, and further listing Dawn Knapp as the source of the payment.
- 71. On December 5, 2010, Dave Cole received a confirming email regarding his purchase from Dawn Knapp at dawn0808@msn.com, indicating that the product would be shipped overnight on December 6, 2010, and asking Dave to reply for with his free activation request. See Exhibit H.
- 72. On December 7, 2010, Dave Cole received a package containing the product ordered by him on December 5, 2010 from Defendant. The return address on the package was AUTOENGINUITY, L.L.C., 4808278665, 3715 E. PALM ST, MESA, AZ 85215. See attached Exhibit E.
- 73. Plaintiff's address is 3715 E. Palm Street, Mesa, Arizona, 85215, and Plaintiff's phone number is (480) 827-8665.
 - 74. Plaintiff did not ship the above-referenced package to Dave Cole.

- 75. The above-referenced package, including the falsified return address, was shipped by Defendant.
- 76. On December 7, 2010, Dave Cole contacted Defendant via email requesting the code necessary to allow the product purchased from Defendant to work properly. See attached Exhibit I.
- 77. On December 8, 2010, Defendant provided Dave Cole a fraudulent activation code for the product purchased from Defendant. See attached Exhibit I.
- 78. On December 8, 2010, Dave Cole contacted Plaintiff for product support, believing, based on false representations of Defendant, that he had purchased his product from AutoEnginuity. See attached Exhibit I.
- 79. On December 8, 2010, Plaintiff informed Dave Cole that he had in fact not purchased his product from Plaintiff, and that the activation code provided by Defendant was fraudulent.
- 80. Subsequent to this conversation on December 8, 2010, Dave Cole undertook steps to recover the money he had paid to Defendant.
- 81. Upon information and belief, Dave Cole has not recovered the money he has paid to Defendant.
- 82. Subsequent to this conversation on December 8, 2010, Plaintiff undertook steps to stop Defendant's misuse of Plaintiffs AUTOENGINUITY Marks and the resulting confusion in the marketplace.
- 83. Defendant has or does use the Accused Domain Names to redirect web users to Defendant's website 61-AUTOSCAN, in that attempts to access the Accused Domain Names have or do resolve to the website located at www.61-autoscan.com (see Exhibit J).

- 84. Defendant, on its website 61-AUTOSCAN, has encouraged or does encourage visitors to download pirated copies of Plaintiff's software (see the bottom of attached Exhibit K).
- 85. Defendant, on the Accused Websites, does include, or has included, material in which Plaintiff owns both Trademark and Copyright, without Plaintiff's authorization or permission. (See, for example, attached Exhibit L, showing one of Plaintiff's web pages, and attached Exhibit M, showing a page at one of the Accused Domain Names, including material copied from Plaintiff's website.)
- 86. On information and belief, Defendant owns the website http://autoscommunity.cloudaccess.net.
- 87. Defendant has or does use the Accused Domain Names to redirect web users to Defendant's website autoscommunity.cloudaccess.net, in that attempts to access the Accused Domain Names have or do resolve to the website located at http://autoscommunity.cloudaccess.net (see Exhibit N).
- 88. Defendant's website autoscommunity.cloudaccess.net features scan tool products in direct competition with Plaintiff, and does not feature products marketed or sold by Plaintiff.
- 89. Defendant's use of the Accused Domain Names is a bait and switch designed to lure consumers seeking Plaintiff's products to Defendant's website autoscommunity.cloudaccess.net, where they instead receive information regarding products that complete with Plaintiff's products.

Harm to Plaintiff and the General Public

90. Defendant's unauthorized registration and use of the Accused Domain Names is or was likely to cause, and has in fact caused, confusion, mistake, and deception as to the source or origin of its goods and services, and is or was likely to

falsely suggest, and has in fact falsely suggested, a sponsorship, connection, license or association of Defendant, Defendant's products, the Accused Domain Names, and the Accused Websites with Plaintiff.

- 91. Defendant's actions have irreparably harmed and, if not enjoined, will continue to irreparably harm the general public, which has an inherent interest in being free from confusion, mistake and deception.
- 92. Defendant's activities have irreparably harmed and, if not enjoined, will continue to irreparably harm Plaintiff and Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Trademark Infringement of Federally Registered Trademark No. 3,644,213 under 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1))

- 93. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all averments set forth in the paragraphs above as if fully rewritten herein.
- 94. Defendant's use in commerce of Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks and variations thereof is and was likely to cause confusion, mistake or to deceive.
- 95. Defendant's use in commerce of the Accused Domain Names is and was likely to cause confusion, mistake, or to deceive.
- 96. Defendant's use in commerce of the Accused Websites and material displayed thereon is and was likely to cause confusion, mistake, or to deceive.
- 97. The above-described acts of Defendant constitute trademark infringement in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1), entitling Plaintiff to relief.
- 98. Defendant has unfairly profited from the infringing acts alleged, in an amount to be determined at trial.

- 99. By reason of Defendant's acts, Plaintiff has suffered damage to the goodwill associated with Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks.
- 100. Defendant's activities have irreparably harmed and, if not enjoined, will continue to irreparably harm, Plaintiff and Plaintiff's federally registered AUTOENGINUITY Marks.
- 101. Defendant's activities have irreparably harmed, and if not enjoined, will continue to irreparably harm the general public, who has an interest in being free from confusion, mistake, and deception.
- 102. By reason of Defendant's acts, Plaintiff's remedy at law is not adequate to compensate Plaintiff for the injuries inflicted by Defendant. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to preliminary and permanent injunctive relief against Defendant pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1116.
- 103. By reason of Defendant's willful acts, Plaintiff is entitled to damages, and that those damages be trebled under 15 U.S.C. § 1117.
- 104. This is an exceptional case, making Plaintiff eligible for an award of attorneys' fees under 15 U.S.C. § 1117.
- 105. The infringement by the Defendant has been willful and deliberate, designed specifically to trade upon the enormous goodwill associated with Plaintiff's trademark.
 - 106. Defendants' infringement will continue unless enjoined by this court.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(False Designation of Origin Under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a))

107. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all averments set forth in the paragraphs above as if fully rewritten herein.

108. Defendant's use in commerce of Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks and variations thereof, the Accused Domain Names, and the Accused Websites is likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive the relevant public that the Accused Domain Names, the Accused Websites, the materials displayed thereon, and the products sold thereon, are authorized, sponsored, or approved by, or are affiliated with, Plaintiff.

- 109. Defendant's use of Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks and variations thereof and the Accused Domain Names and Accused Websites is likely to cause confusion among the general public.
- 110. The above-described acts of the Defendant constitute trademark infringement of Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks and false designation of origin in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a), entitling Plaintiff to relief.
- 111. Defendant has unfairly profited from the actions alleged in an amount to be determined at trial.
- 112. By reason of Defendant's acts alleged herein, Plaintiff has suffered damage to the goodwill associated with Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks.
- 113. Defendant's activities have irreparably harmed and, if not enjoined, will continue to irreparably harm Plaintiff and Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks.
- 114. Defendant's activities have irreparably harmed and, if not enjoined, will continue to irreparably harm the general public, which has an interest in being free from confusion, mistake and deception.
- 115. By reason of Defendant's acts alleged herein, Plaintiff's remedy at law is not adequate to compensate Plaintiff for the injuries inflicted by Defendant.

Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to preliminary and permanent injunctive relief against Defendant pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1116.

- 116. By reason of Defendant's willful acts, Plaintiff is entitled to damages, and that those damages be trebled, under 15 U.S.C. § 1117.
- 117. This is an exceptional case, making Plaintiff eligible for an award of attorneys' fees under 15 U.S.C. §1117.
- 118. Defendants' use of the Accused Domain Names and Accused Websites constitutes a false designation of origin which is likely to deceive and has deceived customers and prospective customers into believing that Defendant's goods and services are those of the Plaintiff, and, as a consequence, are likely to divert and have diverted customers away from the Plaintiff.
- and services rendered by Defendants. Any failure, neglect or default by Defendants in providing such goods and services will reflect adversely on Plaintiff as the believed source of origin thereof, hampering efforts by Plaintiff to continue to protect its outstanding reputation for high quality goods and services, resulting in loss of sales thereof and the considerable expenditures to promote its goods and services under the AUTOENGINUITY Marks, all to the irreparable harm of the Plaintiff.
- 120. Defendants' false designation of origin will continue unless enjoined by this court.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Cybersquatting Under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(d))

121. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all averments set forth in the paragraphs above as if fully rewritten herein.

- 122. Defendant's registered, trafficked or used the Accused Domain Names and Accused Websites with a bad-faith intent to profit from Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks.
- 123. Defendant is and was the registrant of the Accused Domain Names autoenginuity.net and autoenginuityscantool.com.
- 124. The Accused Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks.
- 125. Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks are distinctive, and Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY mark was registered at the United States Patent and Trademark Office at the time Defendant registered, trafficked in, or used the Accused Domain Names.
- 126. Defendant does not have any intellectual property rights or any other rights in Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks.
- 127. None of the Accused Domain Names consist of the legal name of the Defendant, or a name that is otherwise commonly used to identify the Defendant.
- 128. Defendant has not made any prior use of any of the Accused Domain Names in connection with the bona fide offering of any goods or services.
- 129. Defendant has not made any bona fide fair use of Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks on a website accessible under any of the Accused Domain Names.
- 130. Defendant registered, used, and is using the Accused Domain Names to divert consumers from Plaintiff's website, www.autoenginuity.com, to the Accused Websites accessible under the Accused Domain Names www.autoenginuity.net and www.autoenginuityscantool.com for Defendant's commercial gain by creating a

likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Accused Websites and Defendant's Websites and the products sold thereon or thereby.

- 131. Defendant provided material and false and misleading contact information by falsifying return address information on products shipped by Defendant in response to inquiries to websites accessed using the Accused Domain Names, with the express purpose that its customers would be confused into believing that they were dealing with AutoEnginuity rather than Defendant.
- 132. Defendant has registered or acquired multiple domain names, the Accused Domain Names, that Defendant knew were identical or confusingly similar to marks of others, including the AUTOENGINUITY Marks, that were distinctive when the domain names were registered.
- 133. Defendant's registration, use, or trafficking in the Accused Domain Names constitutes cybersquatting in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1125(d), entitling Plaintiff to relief.
- 134. By reason of Defendant's acts alleged herein, Plaintiff's remedy at law is not adequate to compensate Plaintiff for the injuries inflicted by Defendant.

 Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to preliminary and permanent injunctive relief pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1116.
- 135. By reason of Defendant's acts alleged herein, Plaintiff is entitled to recover Defendant's profits, actual damages, and the costs of the action, or statutory damages under 15 U.S.C. § 1117, on election by Plaintiff, in an amount of one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000.00) for each domain name found to constitute cybersquatting.

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

136. This is an exceptional case, making Plaintiff eligible for an award of attorneys' fees under 15 U.S.C. § 1117.

DEMAND FOR JUDGMENT

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant as follows:

- 1. That a preliminary injunction be entered, enjoining Defendant, its agents, representatives, employees, assigns and suppliers, and all persons acting in concert or privity with Defendant, from engaging in the following activities:
 - a. Registering, trafficking in, and using, in any manner, the Accused
 Domain Names, or any other domain names that are counterfeits of,
 confusingly similar to, or likely to dilute Plaintiff's
 AUTOENGINUITY Marks or any other marks owned by Plaintiff;
 - b. Transferring, releasing, deleting, and assigning the Accused Domain Names or any other domain names that are counterfeits of, confusingly similar to, or likely to dilute Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks or any other marks owned by Plaintiffs, to anyone other than Plaintiff;
 - c. Using any of Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks or any other name, mark, designation or depiction in a manner that is likely to cause confusion regarding whether Defendant is affiliated or associated with or sponsored by Plaintiff, or that is likely to dilute the distinctiveness of Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks or any other marks owned by Plaintiff;
 - d. Engaging in trademark infringement, trademark dilution, counterfeiting, unfair competition, false advertising, false designation

- of origin, and passing off against Plaintiff, or misappropriation of Plaintiff's trademark rights;
- e. Assisting, aiding, or abetting any other person or business entity in engaging in or performing any of the activities referred to in subparagraphs (a) through (d) above.
- 2. That Wild West Domains, as the registrar for the Infringing Domain Names, "lock" the Infringing Domain Names currently owned by Defendant to prevent their transfer or deletion by Defendant, and deposit with the Court documents sufficient to establish the Court's control and authority regarding the disposition of the registrations and the use of the domain names pending the outcome in this case, and remove such domain names from its zone files so that the domain names no longer resolve to active websites.
- 3. That the Court enter a final judgment that Defendant has:
 - a. Violated plaintiff's rights in Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1125(d);
 - b. Violated Plaintiff's rights in Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1); and
 - c. Violated Plaintiff's rights in Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a).
- 4. That the Court enter a Final Judgment:
 - a. Permanently enjoining Defendant, its agents, representatives,
 employees, assigns and suppliers, and all persons acting in concert or
 privity with Defendant, from engaging in the activities described in
 Paragraph 1 (a)-(e) above;

- b. Ordering Defendant to transfer to Plaintiff the Accused Domain Names and every domain name they own or control, directly or indirectly, or that was registered at their direction, request, or instruction, that is identical, confusingly similar to, and/or likely to dilute the distinctiveness of Plaintiff's AUTOENGINUITY Marks;
- c. Ordering Defendant to account to Plaintiff for, and disgorge, all profits it has derived by reason of the unlawful acts complained of above;
- d. Ordering Defendant to pay damages, and that those damages be trebled, under 15 U.S.C. § 1117;
- e. Ordering Defendant to pay statutory damages under 15 U.S.C. §
 1117(d), on election by Plaintiff, in an amount of up to \$100,000 for
 each domain name found to constitute cybersquatting;
- f. Ordering Defendant to pay Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees, prejudgment interest, and costs of this action under 15 U.S.C. § 1117;
- g. Ordering Defendant to file with the Court and serve upon Plaintiff a written report under oath setting forth in detail the manner and form in which Defendant has complied with the injunction and judgment within thirty (30) days after the service of the injunction and judgment upon Defendant;
- h. Ordering Defendant to pay punitive damages in an amount to be determined, based upon the foregoing acts of Defendant; and
- i. Granting Plaintiff such other relief as the Court may deem appropriate.

DATEDAL!	1	•	2011
DATED this	day of	,	2011.

Case 2:11-cv-00396-ROS Document 1 Filed 03/02/11 Page 24 of 25

SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS LLP

By:

/Jeffrey W. Johnson/

Jeffrey W. Johnson Sean K. Enos SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS, LLP 18 E. University Drive, Suite 101 Mesa, Arizona 85201 Attorneys for AutoEnginuity, LLC

VERIFICATION OF THE COMPLAINT

I am the owner of AutoEnginuity, LLC. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the Complaint, and I verify that I have read the foregoing Complaint and the allegations and statements therein. I further verify that the allegations and statements are true to the best of my knowledge, except as to those matters stated upon information and belief and, as to those, I believe them to be true.

DATED this 22 day of February, 2011.

Jay Horak